



VERDICT

We, the jury, find as follows:

I. INFRINGEMENT

Do you find that ePlus has proven that it is more likely than not that the following accused configurations of the Lawson S3 Procurement System have infringed the listed claims of the ePlus patents, either directly or indirectly? (As to each claim, a "YES" answer is a finding for ePlus. A "NO" answer is a finding for Lawson.)

Configuration No. 1: Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation

("LSF")/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules)

'516 Patent, claim 1: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 6: YES _____ NO ✓

Configuration No. 2: Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation

("LSF")/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules) and Requisition Self-Service or "RSS"

'683 Patent, claim 3: YES _____ NO ✓

'683 Patent, claim 28: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 1: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 6: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 9: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 21: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 22: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 29: YES _____ NO ✓

'172 Patent, claim 1: YES ✓ NO _____

Configuration No. 3: Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation

(“LSF”)/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules), Requisition Self-Service or “RSS,” and Punchout

'683 Patent, claim 3: YES ✓ NO _____

'683 Patent, claim 26: YES ✓ NO _____

'683 Patent, claim 28: YES ✓ NO _____

'683 Patent, claim 29: YES ✓ NO _____

'516 Patent, claim 1: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 2: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 6: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 9: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 21: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 22: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 29: YES _____ NO ✓

'172 Patent, claim 1: YES ✓ NO _____

Configuration No. 4: Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation

(“LSF”)/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules) and Electronic Data Interchange or “EDI”

'683 Patent, claim 26: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 1: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 6: YES _____ NO ✓

Configuration No. 5: Core S3 Procurement System (Lawson System Foundation

(“LSF”)/Process Flow, in combination with Inventory Control, Requisition, and Purchase Order Modules), Requisition Self-Service or “RSS”, Punchout, and Electronic Data Interchange or “EDI”

'683 Patent, claim 3: YES ✓ NO _____

'683 Patent, claim 26: YES ✓ NO _____

'683 Patent, claim 28: YES ✓ NO _____

'683 Patent, claim 29: YES ✓ NO _____

'516 Patent, claim 1: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 2: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 6: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 9: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 21: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 22: YES _____ NO ✓

'516 Patent, claim 29: YES _____ NO ✓

'172 Patent, claim 1: YES ✓ NO _____

II. VALIDITY

(As to each claim, a "YES" answer is a finding for Lawson. A "NO" answer is a finding for ePlus.)

A) Do you find that Lawson has proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims are anticipated by the Fisher RIMS system?

'683 Patent, claim 3:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'683 Patent, claim 26:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'683 Patent, claim 28:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'683 Patent, claim 29:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'516 Patent, claim 1:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'516 Patent, claim 2:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'516 Patent, claim 6:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'516 Patent, claim 9:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'516 Patent, claim 21:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'516 Patent, claim 22:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'516 Patent, claim 29:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'172 Patent, claim 1:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

B) Do you find that Lawson has proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims are anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,712,989?

'683 Patent, claim 3:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'683 Patent, claim 26:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'683 Patent, claim 28:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'683 Patent, claim 29:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'516 Patent, claim 1:	YES _____	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

'516 Patent, claim 2: YES _____ NO ✓
'516 Patent, claim 6: YES _____ NO ✓
'516 Patent, claim 9: YES _____ NO ✓
'516 Patent, claim 21: YES _____ NO ✓
'516 Patent, claim 22: YES _____ NO ✓
'516 Patent, claim 29: YES _____ NO ✓
'172 Patent, claim 1: YES _____ NO ✓

C) Do you find that Lawson has proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims are obvious in light of the combination of (1) either the RIMS System, the RIMS brochure, and/or U.S. Patent No. 5,712,989 and (2) either the TV/2 System, the TV/2 brochure, and/or the TV/2 general information manual?

1) '683 Patent, claim 3: YES _____ NO ✓

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

2) '683 Patent, claim 26: YES _____ NO ✓

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

3) '683 Patent, claim 28: YES _____ NO ✓

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

4) '683 Patent, claim 29: YES _____ NO

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

5) '516 Patent, claim 1: YES _____ NO

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

6) '516 Patent, claim 2: YES _____ NO

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

7) '516 Patent, claim 6: YES _____ NO

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

8) '516 Patent, claim 9: YES _____ NO

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

9) '516 Patent, claim 21: YES _____ NO

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

10) '516 Patent, claim 22: YES _____ NO

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

11) '516 Patent, claim 29: YES _____ NO

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

12) '172 Patent, claim 1: YES _____ NO

If you answered YES, list the combination of the alleged prior art references that you have found render the claim obvious. If you answered NO, you do not need to list any references:

INSTRUCTION: CONTINUE AND SIGN VERDICT FORM ON NEXT PAGE

You each must sign this Verdict Form.

Dated: Jan. 27, 2011

Deanne W. Wight
FOREPERSON

Carolyn

Buster Caufield

Ruben Conner

Angie Kelly

Jane R.

Machelle Langley

Kathy Raymond